

UN
August 16, 1966

All of the above States show percentages which range as high as 15 percent above the national average, and as high as 38 percent above New York City, with its Sullivan law.

In addition, gun murders in this country are increasing every year.

In 1963, there were 4,760 gun murders. In 1964, there were 5,090 gun murders.

And, in 1965, there were 5,634 gun murders.

In the 3 years combined, over half of the 30,000 persons murdered in this country were killed by gunfire.

In the fact of these statistics and the serious increases in crime in the last 4 years, even the most skeptical of gun enthusiasts should be willing to admit that gun laws, as a deterrent to the misuse of firearms, do in fact work.

To say otherwise is to exhibit a total disregard for the facts.

Yet those who have opposed my efforts to secure enactment of effective Federal gun control seem oblivious to the realities of crime and law enforcement in this country.

As a result of loose firearm control laws many thousands of Americans who could still be alive, lie dead today. Nothing can be done for them.

It is on behalf of the living, whose lives may yet be lost, that we must now act. Even while we hesitate here innocent lives are everyday taken by madmen and criminals armed with guns which they have obtained often without restraint or control of any kind.

We have a bill before the Judiciary Committee which, as part of the slow process of social change and social improvement, could begin to reshape the primitive attitudes of some of our people toward the use of firearms.

The young man in the Texas tower was a victim both of his own and of our society's pathology. And in the web of life in which few things are unrelated, we all share the blame for his plight and for the fate of the people whom he sent to their deaths.

If we pass this bill in this Congress, we can begin to mold a society for future generations—a society in which no young man will be so conditioned by a perverse attachment to firearms, and the hostility and violence which this engenders, that, in the throes of mental illness, he will resort to mass murder by guns to escape the terror of a darkened mind.

The legislation many of us have worked on for so long is ready. The question is, is this Congress ready to consider this long-overdue step that will carry us out of the era of the frontier and put us in step with the rest of the civilized world?

In no other country in the world that I know of which claims to be civilized does a situation exist like that which prevails in our country. In most countries the situation is far superior in the sense that there is better control over using, possessing, and owning firearms.

In my opinion Congress is ready for this action and I hope that it will soon take action.

VETERAN OF VIETNAM FED UP WITH U.S. EFFORT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD an article from The Arizona Republic, of Phoenix, Ariz., entitled "Vietnam Vet Fed Up With U.S. Effort."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM VET FED UP WITH U.S. EFFORT (By Robert J. Sarti)

A young, decorated veteran of the Vietnam fighting is on his way back to the war zone today, but he's bound never to shoulder a rifle again—at least not in Southeast Asia.

For poetry-writing, philosophy-reading Spec. 4 Paul Edwin Fritz of Tempe, a former John Birch Society member and two-time volunteer for duty in Vietnam, is now dead set against U.S. policies there and he's willing to go to jail in support of his convictions.

"I will fight to defend my country because I love my country," says Fritz, who won't be 20 until next month. "But nobody has been able really to show me that we are defending the United States of America over there."

Fritz, who graduated in 1964 from Mesa High School, fought through 11 months in Vietnam, was wounded twice and won the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart. But when he arrives at his base tomorrow he intends—on the advice of his lawyer—to request conscientious objector status immediately and a transfer to noncombatant duty in some other part of the world.

For the former high school track star and football player, the U.S. involvement in the Vietnam struggle is indefensible legally, morally and pragmatically. At the same time, he contends, it has led to a distressing tendency toward conformity and intimidation at home, where the greatest threat to our freedom lies.

"We're trying to stop communism in Vietnam," he says, "but the governments we've been supporting there are so rotten and corrupt that they actually make the Communists look appealing. We've failed to spread anticommunism effectively, but we have succeeded in making the Communists more hardcore and in turning many neutralists into Communists."

Fritz does not condone the acts of terrorism committed by the Vietcong, but he believes he understands why the Communist atrocities have had less adverse propaganda effect than ours.

"The Vietcong are not alienating the people of South Vietnam because they are the people, they are Vietnamese," he says. "They are Orientals fighting against Occidental Caucasians—us. Race is playing an important part in this war, and the people there are beginning to hate all white men."

Fritz says he has seen and participated in attacks which have destroyed a peasant village on the scantiest evidence of Viet sympathizers there. He also claims direct knowledge of the use of torture by both sides.

He says it is this kind of activity which, regardless of U.S. intentions, has disenchanted many Vietnamese with their American allies. And it is just this sort of military action which indicates to Fritz that, despite administration statements to the contrary, the United States is more interested in winning the war than in negotiating an end to hostilities.

"Militarily, we can win this war by invading North Vietnam and colonizing it," he says. "But we would have to burn it to the ground and then rebuild, just as we did Nazi Germany."

"It's for this reason that I oppose our stand on moral as well as pragmatic grounds. What we are doing there, in effect, is waging a war against the Vietnamese people and not, as we would like to believe, for democracy and against communism."

Fritz also has what he calls "legal" reasons for opposing U.S. involvement, reasons which involve such documents and historical events as the U.S. Constitution and the Geneva Conference of 1954.

He says, for instance, that when the "despotic" Ngo Dinh Diem originally invited U.S. troops into the country, it was as if we had issued the invitation ourselves.

The dry legal arguments, though, are window dressing for Fritz in comparison to the more basic moral and pragmatic problems. Whereas the former were culled from books, the latter were the result of contacts with the Vietnamese people and his own personal soul-searching.

Three days after graduating from high school he enlisted in the Army because "I had no idea of what I wanted to do and I knew they would be getting me anyway." While stationed at Ft. Hood, Tex., last July he volunteered for combat duty in Vietnam.

"I had been in the Army a little better than a year and I was bored," he says. "I was 18 then and the romantic aspects of the war, as well as the better pay and possibilities for promotion, seemed pretty attractive."

"If I'd written down a list of why I wanted to go, patriotism would have been pretty far down. Actually, I felt I was a professional soldier and I just wanted to do my job, which was to fight."

Fighting was what he did for 11 months, and last month he asked for an extension of his term of duty in Vietnam. But, in the meanwhile, he had sought out many Vietnamese students in Saigon to learn their views of the war.

"I was curious about the young Vietnamese and when I got to know them I found out that they didn't support the Saigon government. They are fiercely nationalistic and they resent foreign domination; whether ours or the Communists."

Fritz says that the students, most of whom were Christians, explained to him that the current war is an extension of one which has been continuing for 20 years, and all with the same objective: elimination of foreign influence.

"From my experience and from contacts with the enemy and from past published reports, I found that the ratio of Vietcong to North Vietnamese is about 9-to-1. The impression that we get in this country is that it's an all-out invasion, when actually it's a civil war."

Fritz is in favor of unilateral American withdrawal from Vietnam. Then the Vietnamese (North and South are really one country, he says) could decide their own fate.

"I believe the Vietnamese people are so fiercely independent that they would throw off any foreign invader," he says. "If communism took over, it would be a Vietnamese communism and would suit their needs, or they would overthrow it. After all, they hate the Chinese."

Fritz sees little danger in the "international Communist conspiracy," although he stands ready to fight if this country is invaded or seriously threatened. He is quite alarmed, however, at what he considers to be the "drift away from individual responsibility" by Americans.

It is a theme which has concerned the discerning "Christian agnostic" for several years and which had got him interested originally in the Birch Society and the presidential candidacy of Barry Goldwater. He now says he is less dogmatic, but still sees disquieting signs in such events as the civil rights acts and the big-city riots.

"Our greatest enemy is apathy and loss of individual responsibility," he says. "I don't think we have anything to fear from direct armed invasion, but I do think there is a possibility of an internal breakdown due to the downgrading of morality."

Facing up in the last few weeks to what he sees as his own responsibility, Fritz now hopes the Army will allow him to follow the dictates of his conscience while still doing his duty. He hopes to get an honorable discharge eventually and to go to college.

"I want to serve my country in the best way I can and still keep my moral integrity,"

August 16, 1966

he says. "The next 90 days probably will tell whether I'll be allowed to."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the article points out that the veteran, who fought in Vietnam for 11 months, is seeking to be classified as a conscientious objector because he has come to the conclusion that our war in Vietnam is immoral, unjustified, we are not wanted there, it is a civil war, and we have no business there. He has announced that he refuses to do any more killing and is asking to be reassigned as a conscientious objector.

OREGON'S FOREST FUTURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is well known in the Senate that during my years of service here, I have sought to prevent the mowing down of the great forests of my State by predatory economic interests that put the profit dollar above the rich profits that generations of Americans have a right to enjoy as trustees of the natural resources of their country, in this instance, our forests.

In the past several weeks, I have used my desk in the Senate to warn the people of my State and the country that there are signs of renewed effort on the part of certain predatory economic interests to seek to devastate our forests by unwise cutting practices.

I add an additional, brief chapter to this account this afternoon, but I shall continue to speak out periodically in opposition to those predatory economic forces in my State which have designs upon our forests and who take advantage of every opportunity to follow a nonconservation practice in respect to the cutting of timber.

Mr. President, questions involving forest policy, especially on the national forests administered by the Forest Service and lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management in Oregon, are subjects of lively interest in my State. This is to be expected because Oregon is the largest timber State in the Nation and its national forests and other Federal forests are most productive.

Unfortunately, issues came up from time to time on which the facts are not available and many well-meaning people are misled. When people fail to understand the facts, the solutions they seek may be erroneous.

Earlier, I instructed members of my staff to undertake an analysis of timber issues in Oregon. However, this matter became so complex that I decided to turn to the Forest Service for some further facts. Later, I consulted on the same topic with the Bureau of Land Management.

Out of this consultation grew a staff paper, entitled "The Timber Supply and Demand Situation in Western Oregon," which has been prepared jointly by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

I make these preliminary statements because in this period a new Bureau of Land Management Director—Mr. Boyd Rasmussen—has been appointed. He came from a long background in the Forest Service. Lest anyone should get erroneous ideas when I say that the staffs

of these two great conservation agencies have worked together in producing this fine joint effort, I should point out that this cooperative effort does not presage a merger of the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management.

There are some people in my State who are trying to read into Secretary Udall's selection of Mr. Rasmussen to head the Bureau of Land Management, their own ideas or fears of what this may mean.

I want it clear that this joint paper was prepared because I asked these two agencies to cooperate.

There is a great deal of discussion in various segments of the timber industry about allowable cuts, speed-up cutting in public forests, and the export of logs from Oregon.

The excellent paper that was prepared for me highlights the basic and controlling facts.

LOG EXPORTS

First. One significant fact for those who are concerned about log exports is that in 1965 they totaled 2.7 percent of total log production in Oregon or 199 million board feet of logs.

Second. Only three Oregon ports export logs.

Third. One hundred and eight million board feet of these exports were shipped from Astoria which is 60 miles from the nearest Federal forests. Thus, practically all of these logs probably were from private lands.

Fourth. Two-thirds of the logs shipped from Coos Bay—29 out of 45 million board feet—were Port Orford cedar, a log traditionally exported.

This log, incidentally, does not have any great commercial demand in our own country. It is a type of log which is used in some foreign lands, but has a difficult time competing in this country with more desirable types of lumber.

Fifth. Federal timber exported probably accounts for less than 1 percent of the log production in Oregon. Yet the protesters in regard to log exportations tend to lead one to believe that quantitatively this is a matter of great importance and concern to the lumber industry of my State. The facts presented in this joint paper would not seem to bear out their fears.

Those who think it would be wise to control log exports through controls on logs exported from Federal forests ought to weight these facts.

In addition, Secretary of Commerce Connor's letter of August 8 to my colleague, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], on the fact that the log exports do not meet the short supply criterion, is a significant document for study by those who would control log exports.

Secretary of Commerce Connor's letter to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] appears in the joint study which, just before closing my remarks, I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD.

ALLOWABLE CUTS—SUSTAINED YIELD

It is significant that the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management reaffirm their support for maintaining sustained-yield under the even-flow con-

cept. They point out that there are opportunities to increase the cutting of timber by salvaging mortality in old stands, undertaking thinnings in young stands, and adopting other steps which intensify their management of the forest.

The Forest Service-BLM staff paper points out the growing inroads that have been made on private timber stocks and the fact that private timber stands will be further depleted. This is a matter which will require conscientious study in my State, because it points up the seriousness of our timber supply situation at present, and for the future.

Some people take the position that the timber supply should meet the needs for the installed industrial capacity dependent upon the timber. Others argue that the installed industrial capacity cannot continue to use more than the land can produce under foreseeable levels of management.

The heavy inroads already made and projected for private timber also raise serious questions about community stability as private stocks are further depleted.

What is the public responsibility and what is the private responsibility? In my view both public and private officials need to develop a mechanism for coming to grips with this issue. It is the root of the dilemma that confronts our State. It is the cause for some of the bizarre suggestions and panaceas that are being advanced as "solutions."

The staff paper to which I have alluded lists the sources of data used. They are too voluminous to print in the RECORD. However, should anyone wish to obtain them I shall be pleased to direct them to the proper source of these publications.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks my letter, of August 10, 1966, to the Chief of the Forest Service which is identical to a letter I addressed on the same to the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and the text of identical replies I received from Associate Director Greeley of the Forest Service and Director Rasmussen of the Bureau of Land Management, dated August 15, 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. In addition, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Forest Service-BLM paper entitled "The Timber Supply and Demand Situation in Western Oregon," be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, along with related correspondence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MORSE. At this time I want to express my appreciation to the chief of the Forest Service, Mr. Edward Cliff and Director Boyd Rasmussen for the work they and their staffs undertook at my request. I shall look forward to the constructive comments that people in my State may wish to offer, along with their ideas on how to achieve conservation goals in the proper management of our Federal timber.